



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,681	03/11/2005	Mario Scholz	39509-213285	9162
26694	7590	03/25/2008		
VENABLE LLP				
P.O. BOX 34385				
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998				
EXAMINER				
LOEWE, ROBERT S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/527,681

Applicant(s)

SCHOLZ ET AL.

Examiner

ROBERT LOEWE

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 February 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6 and 7 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6 and 7 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 March 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.84: The drawings (Figures 1 through 5) need to be supplied in English. Applicants have stated that complying drawings will be submitted upon an indication of allowable subject matter.

Specification

Paragraph 0077 of the pregrant publication of the instant application (US 2005/0215696) is confusing. Specifically, Applicants recite that the definition of "normal value" is determined from a series of documents Pigmente No. 11 from Degussa AG (page 30). This graph is not found in the disclosure and it is not known by the Examiner where to obtain this graph. As such, Applicant's definition of "normal value" is not known and therefore the metes and bounds of instant claim 1 cannot be determined.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the misspelling of "liquid". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention. Specifically, the limitation "normal value" is unclear. Applicant's definition of the term "normal value" in the specification is insufficient (see Specification section above). For purposes of further examination the limitation "normal value" will be interpreted as referring to pyrogenically prepared silica which is **undoped**. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically the limitation "as compared with **doped** aerosils" is confusing. It seems that the Applicants meant to claim "**undoped**" since the comparisons made in the experiments presented in the specification compare pyrogenically prepared doped silica of the instant application with **undoped** silica. Paragraphs 0036, 0037, 0085, 0086 and 0090 of the instant pregrant publication teaches that the comparisons are made between the silicas according to the invention and **undoped** silicas). For purposes of further examination, it will be interpreted that instant claim 7 is meant to read --as compared with undoped aerosils--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mangold et al. (US Pat. 6,328,944) in view of Azechi et al. (US Pat. 6,331,588).

Claim 1: Mangold et al. teaches doped, pyrogenically prepared oxides of metals and/or non-metals which are doped with one or more doping components. Mangold et al. further teaches that the pyrogenically prepared oxides of metals and/or non-metals can be used as fillers and additives in the silicone and rubber industry (3:26-36). Mangold et al. further teaches potassium salts may be used as dopant (2:57-58) and that the doping salts are introduced by means of aerosol (2:5-45). Mangold further teaches doping levels of 0.00001 to 20 wt% (1:35) and BET surface areas of the doped oxides between 5 and 600 m²/g (1:39-40). See MPEP 2131.03 (anticipation of ranges). Mangold et al. does not specifically teach DBP absorption of the fumed oxide being undetectable or being less than 85% of the normal value for that of fumed silica. However, Mangold et al. anticipates all of the claim limitations of instant claim 1 because the fumed silica taught by Mangold et al. is prepared in a substantially similar manner as the fumed silica prepared in the instant application. Thus, it is expected that the materials prepared according to Mangold et al. would implicitly have the same properties, in this case, DBP absorption, as the instant application.

Mangold et al. further teaches that the doped, pyrogenically prepared silicas can be used as fillers for silicone rubbers. Mangold et al. does not explicitly teach that the doped silicas can be used as fillers for **liquid** silicone rubbers. However, Azechi et al. teaches liquid silicone

Art Unit: 1796

rubber (LSR) compositions having fumed silica fillers with BET surface areas of from 50 to 600 m²/g (abstract and 4:55-61). Mangold et al. and Azechi et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely, compositions containing pyrogenically prepared oxide. At the time of invention, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to employ the doped, pyrogenically prepared oxides as taught by Mangold et al. as fillers into the liquid silicone rubber compositions as taught by Azechi et al. with and would have been motivated to do so since Mangold et al. teaches that the addition of doped, pyrogenically prepared silicas can be used as fillers for silicone rubbers to adjust the rheology of liquid systems and to provide heat-stabilization (3:26-36).

Claim 6: Mangold et al. teaches that the doping amount is preferably in the range of 1 to 10,000 ppm (1:35-36), which falls into the range of instant claim 6.

Claim 7: Mangold et al. does not explicitly teach that the silicone rubber compositions having the doped, pyrogenically prepared silica fillers present exhibit lower viscosities and flow limits as compared with fumed silicas of equal or similar surface area. However, Mangold et al. teaches all of the claimed ingredients, process steps and process conditions as claimed; thus, the claimed effects and physical properties would implicitly be achieved by carrying out the disclosed process. If it is Applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be presented to support applicants' position; and (2) it would be the examiner's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure in that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties and effects by carrying out only these steps.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mangold et al. (US Pat. 6,328,944) in view of Itoh et al. (US Pat. 4,755,554).

Mangold et al. teaches fumed silica doped with potassium by means of aerosol (Example 5). Mangold et al. further teaches that the pyrogenically prepared, potassium doped silicas can be used as fillers for silicone rubbers (3:26-36).

Mangold et al. does not explicitly teach that the doped silicas can be used as fillers for high temperature vulcanizing (HTV) silicone rubbers. However, Itoh et al. teaches high-temperature vulcanizable/heat curable (HTV) silicone rubber compositions which comprise pyrogenically prepared silica as fillers (abstract and 4:31-40). Mangold et al. and Itoh et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely, compositions containing pyrogenically prepared oxide. At the time of invention, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to employ the doped, pyrogenically prepared oxides as taught by Mangold et al. as fillers into the high-temperature vulcanizable/high-temperature curable silicone rubber compositions as taught by Itoh et al. and would have been motivated to do so since Mangold et al. teaches that the addition of doped, pyrogenically prepared silicas can be used as fillers for silicone rubbers to provide heat-stabilization (3:26-36) which would be a desirable property given the high temperature curing conditions employed by Itoh et al. (6:34-44).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendments to instant claim 1 effectively removes the 102(b) rejection [Mangold et al. (US Pat. 6,328,944)] of instant claims 1, 6 and 7. However, Mangold et al. is still relied upon in a 103(a) rejection (vide supra).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3 (now canceled; the limitations of canceled claim 3 have been included in instant claim 1) and 4 have been considered but are not persuasive. With regards to the 103(a) rejection (Mangold et al. in view of Azechi et al.), Applicants argue that Azechi et al. does not teach or suggest the use of potassium doped silica as fillers to lower the viscosity and/or Williams plasticity. The Examiner does not disagree. Azechi et al. is relied upon as a teaching of liquid silicone rubber compositions. Mangold et al. is relied upon due to the teaching of fumed silicas which are doped with potassium and can be added to silicone rubbers to adjust the rheology of liquid systems, and for heat stabilization purposes. Therefore, the motivation to add the silica fillers as taught by Mangold et al. into the liquid silicone rubbers of Itoh et al. is rooted within the teachings of Mangold et al.

With regards to the 103(a) rejection (Mangold et al. in view of Itoh et al.), Applicants argue that Itoh et al. do not teach or suggest potassium doped silica as fillers to lower the viscosity and/or Williams plasticity. The Examiner does not disagree. Itoh et al. is relied upon as a teaching of high-temperature vulcanizing silicone rubber compositions. Mangold et al. is relied upon due to the teaching of fumed silicas which are doped with potassium and can be added to silicone rubbers for heat stabilization purposes. Therefore, the motivation to add the silica fillers as taught by Mangold et al. into the high temperature vulcanizing silicone rubbers of Itoh et al. is rooted within the teachings of Mangold et al.

It should be noted that in footnote 1 of Applicant's response that the pyrogenically prepared, potassium doped silicas prepared by Mangold et al. and those of the instant application are not prepared in the same way. Specifically, Applicants show that Mangold et al. does not employ additional oxygen in the preparation of the fumed silicas and employs (slightly) different

amounts of hydrogen, silicon chloride and air. However, the instant claims are directed to a composition and not a process. Applicants are required to show that the pyrogenically prepared, potassium doped silicas prepared according to the instant application are patentably distinct as compared to the potassium doped silicas produced by the process of Mangold et al.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Loewe whose telephone number is (571) 270-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 5:30 AM to 3:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Application/Control Number: 10/527,681

Page 9

Art Unit: 1796

24-Mar-08

/Randy Gulakowski/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796